REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the non-final Office Action mailed July 5, 2005.

Claims 16-32 are pending. Claim 33 is newly added.

The Office Action objected to claims 28 and 29 on page 5 of the amendment dated April 8, 2005, because of informalities. The claims are now correctly numbered as 31 and 32.

The Office Action rejected claims 16-26, 28 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,208,335 to Gordon et al. ("Gordon"). Claim 16 recites as follows:

> A method for navigating video images, comprising:
> receiving, by a cable headend, a navigation command initiated from a remote control associated with a set top box, the navigation command including a requested direction and being associated with a selected object on a video image, the video image having a plurality of frames corresponding to HTML frames in at least one web page, the frames being independently controllable sections in the web page, the video image being presented on a display device associated with the set top box, the selected object being within a first frame on the video image;
> determining, by the cable headend, whether the selected object is located at an edge of the first frame in the requested direction;
> providing navigation on the display device, the navigation being in the requested direction from the selected object in the first frame to a same-frame object that is also in the first frame, when the selected object is not located at an edge of the first frame in the requested direction; and
> providing navigation on the display device, the navigation being in the requested direction from the selected object in the first frame to a different-frame object in a second frame, when the selected object is located at an edge of the first frame in the requested direction, the second frame being in the requested direction from the first frame.

To anticipate a claim under §102, the reference must teach every element of the claim. Here, Gordon fails to teach every element of each claim. For example, Gordon fails to teach at least the step of "the video image having a plurality of frames corresponding to HTML frames in at least one web page, the frames being independently controllable sections in the web page." Specifically, the Gordon

400371_1

reference does not utilize HTML frames; rather, the Gordon reference utilizes a single video layer and a single graphics layer. Referring to column 7, lines 41-44 of Gordon, it is stated that: "the background video comprises a video player, while the overlay or foreground video comprises a graphic layer. The generation of both the video layer and graphics layer is controlled by a control layer." There is simply no use of frames within the Gordon reference, much less the "HTML frames" claimed herein.

The Examiner cites column 8, lines 45-51 as teaching the claimed "HTML frames." Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portion of Gordon recites as follows:

> "The navigator descriptor files are written in an HTML like language syntax specifically designed for this application. Each definition type starts with an angle bracket "<" immediately preceding the definition name. The definition type ends with an angle bracket, a forward slash "</" and then the definition name."

The above-quoted portion of Gordon has nothing to do with the use of HTML frames. HTML is simply a markup language in which many different functions may be defined. To the extent that HTML is used within the context of the Gordon arrangement, the use of HTML is limited to the format used for descriptor files (i.e., no use of HTML to define HTML frames, as claimed). The Gordon descriptor files are subsequently defined in columns 8-9. There is no use of the HTML concept of frames within the descriptor files.

The Examiner cites figure 3 of Gordon as teaching the claimed "the video image of being presented on a display device associated with the set-top box, the selected object to being within a first frame on the video image...." Applicants respectfully disagree. As noted above, the Gordon arrangement simply does not use HTML frames (though it does use an "HTML like language syntax specifically designed for this application"), per column 8, lines 45-46. Specifically, as noted above, figure 3 depicts illustrative menu imagery; namely a "compass" menu screen 300 (see column 7 lines 20-28). This menu imagery is defined by Gordon as including background video and an overlay or foreground video of typically transparent on-screen display (OSD) bitmap graphics positioned atop the background video. These two layers do not comprise frames, much less HTML frames.

400371_1

7

Therefore, claim 16 is patentable over Gordon under §102. Since claim 24 recites relevant limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 16, it is respectfully submitted that claim 24 is also patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 16. Moreover, the remaining claims depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 16 or claim 24 and recite additional limitations therefrom. Thus, these claims are also patentable for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 16.

The Office Action rejected claims 27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gordon in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,100,875 to Goodman et al. ("Goodman"). Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Examiner is directed to the above discussion of the deficiencies of the Gordon reference as applied to the claimed invention. The Goodman reference fails to bridge the substantial gap between the Gordon reference and the claimed invention.

Claims 27-29 are patentable because they depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 24, which is patentable for the reasons discussed above.

Claim 33 is newly added. Claim 33 is fully supported by the specification and does not add new matter.

Applicants agree with the Examiner's assertion that "Gordon fails to teach converting a keyboard command into a mouse cursor movement control command, as recited in claim 27." Applicants also note that the Goodman reference discloses a keyboard pointing device in which a special-purpose key, when pressed, causes certain keys upon a full-size keyboard to be designated as "mouse keys" which may be used to effect the movement of a pointer on a display screen.

Newly added claim 33 provides that "said mouse functionality being activated in response to a selection of a predetermined key for more than a threshold amount of time." Thus, the invention of claim 33 does not utilize a "special-purpose key" to enter a mouse mode. Moreover, the claimed invention is utilized within the context of a remote control device interacting with a set top box, rather than a full-size keyboard as disclosed in Goodman.

400371_1

8

CONCLUSION

Thus, Applicants submit that none of the claims, presently in the application, are anticipated or obvious under the respective provisions of 35 U.S.C. §102 or §103. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Eamon J. Wall, Esq. at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: __11/15/05__

Eamon J. Wall
Registration No. 39,414
Attorney for Applicants

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-530-9404
Facsimile: 732-530-9808

400371_1

9